

REMARKS

Status of Claims

Claims 15-18 are pending in the instant application. Claims 15-18 stand finally rejected. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested in light of the following remarks.

Rejection of claims 15-17 under 35 USC 102(b)

Claims 15-17 stand finally rejected under 35 USC 102(b), as being anticipated by Ingemansson et al. (4,569,471).

The Examiner states that claims 15-17 stand finally rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Ingemansson et al. The Examiner states that glass strands are fed into a muffler outer cylinder 14 by a nozzle 9 which blows the threads apart to form a wool-like texture. The Examiner further states that after the glass strands have been deposited into the outer cylinder, a cover plate is temporarily placed over the opening of the cylinder. The Examiner states that the outer cylinder 14 of the muffler constitutes a container since it will contain the strand. The Examiner further states that the cover plate described constitutes a removable cover since it is temporarily placed and since its placement will prevent loss of strand (due to expansion).

Applicants have amended claim 15 to clarify "...wherein said glass strand can be withdrawn from said container for subsequent use when said closure is removed." No new matter has been added and support can be found in the specification at page 2, line 14. Applicants respectfully request that the above amendment be entered as it merely clarifies the invention.

Nowhere does Ingemansson et al. teach or suggest "a glass strand disposed in said container in a texturized, coiled form, wherein said strand can be withdrawn from said container for subsequent use when said closure is removed" as Applicants claim. Ingemansson et al. teaches a muffler having fiberglass wool inserted therein.

Ingemansson et al. specifically teaches a cover plate. The cover plate is temporarily placed over the opening of the muffler as the fiberglass wool has a tendency to expand when suction, from filling the muffler, is stopped. The cover plate prevents the wool from coming out during transport of the muffler (col. 4, lines 1-7). Ingemansson et al. does not teach or suggest subsequently using the glass strand after it has been inserted into the muffler, as Applicants claim.

Claims 16-17 ultimately depend from claim 15 and contain the newly added limitations thereof. Applicants respectfully submit that claims 15-17 are now in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the 102(b) rejection of claims 15-17 be withdrawn.

Rejection of claims 15-17 under 35 USC 103(a)

Claims 15-17 stand finally rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ingemansson (4,569,471) in view of Mattis (3,968,877). The Examiner states that it would have been obvious in view of Mattis to have produced the package of Ingemansson et al. with a closure in the form of closure flaps, making the package suitable for storage and transportation.

As stated above, Applicants have amended claim 15 to clarify that "...wherein said glass strand can be withdrawn from said container for subsequent use when said closure is removed." Claims 16-17 ultimately depend from newly amended claim 15 and contain the limitations thereof. For the reasons stated above, Ingemansson et al. do not teach or suggest Applicants' claimed invention. Mattis teaches a package for the storage of "crimped" acrylic tow, specifically, a "herringbone crimp" (col. 6, line 28). Mackie et al. teach producing crimped filaments of polyolefin or blends of polyolefins. Mattis does not teach a "texturized glass strand" as Applicants claim. There is no mention of glass fibers in Mattis and, further, Mattis teaches "crimped" fibers and not "texturized" strand as Applicants claim.

Neither Mattis nor Ingemansson et al. individually nor the combination of Mattis and Ingemansson et al. teach or suggest all of Applicants' claim limitations. As

such, a case of *prima facie* obviousness cannot be established. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the 103(a) rejection of claims 15-17 be withdrawn.

Rejection of Claim 18

Claim 18 stands finally rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ingemansson et al. in view of Mattis as applied to claim 15 above, and further in view of Galanes (3,670,949). The Examiner states that it would have been obvious in view of Galanes to have made the carton of Ingemansson et al., as modified above, of corrugated cardboard to give the carton strength.

As stated above, neither Mattis nor Ingemansson et al. individually nor the combination of Mattis and Ingemansson et al. teach or suggest all of Applicants' claim limitations (newly amended claim 15). Claim 18 depends from claim 15 and contains the limitations thereof. In view of the fact that neither Mattis nor Ingemansson et al. teach or suggest all of Applicants' claim limitations, one would not look to combine the reference with that of Galanes. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the 103(a) rejection of claim 18 be withdrawn.


Conclusion

The Examiner is invited to telephone the Applicants' undersigned agent at (740) 321-7213 if any unresolved matters remain.

If any questions should arise with respect to the above Remarks, or if the Examiner has any comments or suggestions to place the claims in better condition for allowance, it is requested that the Examiner contact Applicants' agent at the number listed below.

Applicant authorizes any fees required pertaining to this response be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0568.

Respectfully submitted,

By: 
Maria C. Gasaway
Reg. No. 51,721

Date: June 30, 2003

Owens Corning
2790 Columbus Road, Bldg. 54
Granville, OH 43023
(740) 321-7213